E 380
.J523

J523

VINDICATION

OF

AN ADDRESS

TO THE

25-10

CATHOLIC VOTERS

OF

Baltimore.

William Jenkins

Baltimore:
PRINTED BY LUCAS & DEAVER
No. 19 *South Calvert street*
1828.

E 380
.C573

VINDICATION, &c.

Fellow-citizens—After a brief delay, resulting from accidental circumstances, we again appear before you. Respect for you dictated our first address—self-respect commands its vindication:

We rejoice that this can now be achieved without affecting the personal interests, involved in the late election, and that *the evasive course* of those who have undertaken to oppose us, is, by this circumstance, limited to yet narrower ground. They cannot now fly to the shelter of private character under which they crouched before. There is no pretext for them to attempt, again to distract your attention from the general question, by assuming the defence of *a gentleman not assailed by us* and towards whom they must have known we meant no disrespect. So much, therefore, of their multitudinous replies as relates to him, may be dismissed with the simple repetition of our opinion already expressed, and in which the most sensitive of his friends can discover nothing injurious, that his "habits and health alike unfitted him for the contests" into which he was urged by the act of the "Adams Convention."

The ground we assumed, and from which scarce an effort has been made to dislodge us, was this, that a respectable Catholic had been selected, by the Convention above named, in the hope to influence the votes of his fellow-citizens of the same communion. We cannot, even after the disclaimer of privity to the artifice, by the gentlemen who have signed the replies to us, consider this an open question. It has long since been settled by the common sense of this community; that discriminating faculty, which, with native tact, decides on propositions not easily subjected to the test of direct evidence. It was settled by the familiar admissions of candid men who supported him, and by the loudly boastful anticipations of the party itself. Even "Well wisher," though behind a mask, did not venture to contradict our statement; though he laboured, to fritter away the force of his extorted admission, by the qualifying phrase "for the sake of the argument." Nay! if the candidate himself have not been misrepresented (for we did not

hear him) even *he* admitted it, indirectly indeed, but not the less conclusively, when he acknowledged, from the hustings at the Lexington market, that nothing but "THE CAUSE" could have brought him forward. And yet further: if it could, by any possibility, be deemed a derogation from his merit, to suppose that there existed men, in the Adams party, as capable as himself, and more experienced in politics, but without his peculiar influence, we might have sustained our own inferences by those of the Editor of the Patriot, who, four years ago, (it is remembered) held similar language, when Mr. Tiernan was announced as the Crawford elector, before transferring his preferences to General Jackson. But it is wasting time to dwell on general presumptions. We are prepared to show that a member of the Adams Convention did actually apply to a Catholic gentleman, whose politics he mistook, for information touching the *relative weight, in the Catholic congregation*, of Mr. Tiernan and another gentleman of the same party! And were all this otherwise; were the *members* of that *Convention* able and willing to come forward, with an express disavowal of the motives universally imputed to them, we should still stand approved in our views of the nomination by *the use to which it was applied, by individuals* of their party. The respondents to our address avow themselves "ignorant" of such unworthy appeals to religious prejudice. It would have been more consistent *with their disbelief of the fact*, had they challenged us to the proof of what we stated, viz: that we could adduce the names of "more than one, to whom appeals had been made, on that very ground." The pledge was unequivocally given and would have been promptly redeemed. Their utter silence about it; and their silence also, in relation to "the republication, *with the preface for the Catholics*," of Mr. Gaston's address, joined to the evidence, of an appeal to Catholic favour, derived from their own Hagerstown letter, (published long before our address) altogether constitute but a frail support to their languid disclaimer; and are paralleled, for *inconsistency* with their *professions*, only by their eager recurrence to the miserable trash of "King John," and their *faint echo* to the *appeal* of the Adams convention, "you are recommended to withold your suffrages from *a member of your own communion*."

Thus were we justified in taking our stand, as individuals, against an appeal ungenerously addressed to the Catholics of Baltimore.

With how much regard to truth, we executed our task, will be considered hereafter. For the present it is necessary to animadvert upon the course of our antagonists. And here, we would remind them that their predicament is of their own seeking. We struck not at them. Not an individual was attacked by us but the arch slanderer of our church. *They volunteered* in his defence; and if, in the desperate attempt, they have ventured to assail our per-

sonal crediblity, they must not complain should the blow recoil upon themselves.

We propose to notice, in the order of topics, an address signed by fifteen gentlemen, one signed by seventeen gentlemen, and the letter of "Well wisher."

And first, we enter our protest against the principle of the defence set up for Mr. Adams by the seventeen signers, at the expense of the constitutional privileges and dignity of our Church.

It is argued, that *we* must not take offence at the numberless insults private and official which the President has heaped on us, because, say they, (page 2d) "what history, what romance or novel, what play written in the English language represents us in any other light?" "*Where is the Protestant*, in this or any other country, who does not think or speak or write of our faith and worship in any other way?" Now, passing the *perhaps unintentional* substitution of "faith and worship" for the *persons* of *defenceless women*, Silesian priests, Jesuits. &c., *we deny the facts* asserted in their apologetic questions. Our acquaintance with christians of other denominations is extensive. We mingle with thousands in our daily avocations and social enjoyments. Some of us were educated as *protestants*, and have enjoyed a more unequivocal experience. And *we all* are bold to say, that our opponents cannot name, throughout the United States, *one protestant gentleman, in five hundred*, who would disgrace his name, by associating it with the obscene jests and insolent misrepresentations of Mr. Adams. The principles of decency and good manners are too widely disseminated; were those of Christian Charity and Political Tolerance inadequate to restrain such outrages, even from those who most widely and zealously differ from us.

But, were the fact as these gentlemen would have us think it, in their rash effort to blacken all their Christian brethren of other pursuasions, to the hue of their idol's bigotry, we should regard the present call for our rebuke by so much the more imperious. The Catholics, in this country, occupy an equal stand with other Christians. on the platform of the Constitution. In England, whence our opponents borrow so large a portion of their justification of Mr. Adams, Catholics are treated as a degraded *caste*. So far, then, from admitting the excuse derived from our degradation *there*, a degradation which, our adversaries assert, has operated the pollution of the entire literature of the language, we feel it a *duty* proportioned to our *rights*, as brothers of the political household, to resist such encroachments on our privileges *here;* and the *more elevated* the *source* of *injury*, the *more resolute* should be *our opposition!*

The pathetic deprecation of such resistance, in the 3d page of the answer by fifteen, we meet with the same reply;—unless our respondents can prove that he, who privately avenges a private wrong, is in equal right with *communities*, which openly repel those who would openly oppress and vilify them. Indeed, we

have yet to learn that a Christian would violate his duty, by arraigning a slanderer at the tribunals of justice, and exposing his calumnies to refutation and chastisement. We might, with reason, have originated such an appeal against Mr. Adams. His insults to us and our religion, when Secretary of State and President, might alone have been met, as infringements of our constitutional privileges, and fearful indications of the temper of his measures towards us, should circumstances subject us to his will. But we went not so far. We were first invoked, through our brother Catholic, *by our family name*, to support Mr. Adams. We replied, "let Mr. Adams speak to us as Catholics, for himself"—And we farther recommend to him, when next he speaks of Catholics, and to his Catholic partisans, when they again invoke to his support the entire literature of Protestant Christendom, to give a passing thought to the following eloquent passages, from the pens of no feeble champions of the Protestant Churches.

"I shall always acknowledge with gratitude, that chiefly to the *literary* as well as *religious zeal* of our papal ancestors, the English Universities are indebted for "great and goodly cities which we builded not, for vineyards and olive trees which we planted not," for statutes and ordinances, which after the lapse of centuries, and after a succession of mighty changes, both in private and public life, have not ceased to be profitable to learning, morals and piety; and for means most abundant and efficacious to guide, assist and encourage our rising youth, in every pursuit which *adorns* and *invigorates* the *human mind*.—"When we have eaten and are full, let us beware lest we forget" the wisdom, munificence, and generosity of those founders who "brought us forth out of the land of Egyptian darkness, and from the house of intellectual bondage."—(*Dr. Parr.*)

"Politically too, the papacy was the Saviour of Europe; for in all human probability, the west like the east, must have been overrun by Mahommedanism, and sunk in irremediable degradation, through the pernicious institutions which have every where accompanied it, if, in that great crisis of the world, the Roman Church had not *roused the nations* to a united and prodigious effort commensurate with the danger.—(*Southey's "Book of the Church."*)

"In the middle ages," says Mons. Ancillon, a Protestant writer of celebrity, "when there existed" (comparatively) "no social order, *the papacy alone*, perhaps, saved Europe from entire barbarism; it created a communication between the most distant nations; it was a common centre—a rallying point for isolated states. It was a supreme tribunal, raised in the midst of universal anarchy, the decrees of which were sometimes as respectable as they were respected. It prevented and checked the despotism of the Emperors, supplied the want of a political balance, and diminished the defects of the feudal government." We should compile a book were we to prosecute this subject much further.

The point of the defence to which we next advert, (and in sorrow do we note the length to which party prejudice will carry men) we select from the 4th page of the answer by fifteen—After quoting at length certain parts of the fourth of July oration denounced by us, and we shall soon shew that we denounced it correctly, they proceed, "Is there a sentence or phrase in these eloquent extracts which can be construed by any liberal and intelligent reader, into an outrageous and unprovoked attack on Catholic feelings, or a desire to stigmatize the religion of Cœcilius Calvert, Charles Carroll and O'Connel? It is an impeachment of *those enormities and encroachments on the pure simplicity and Christian Holiness of the Church*, which exposed some of its professors, about the middle of the 17th century, to the severe reproof of the celebrated PASCAL, *himself a* CATHOLIC *and* A PRIEST; and which have been so deservedly rebuked by the pious and informed Catholics of all subsequent times, as tending to bring into disrepute a faith which breathes purity and holiness and self-denial, and to hold up its followers as apostates in practice, although orthodox in profession. It is *that spirit of usurpation, which led to the desolation of the fairest portions of Europe and Asia, and the destruction of millions of the human race—that spirit* which is *chastised* and *purified* into the *meeker* and *more Christian principle* which *regulates the discipline* and *practice* of the *Church* in our day."

Now to this we reply, first, for the information of all concerned, that PASCAL WAS NEITHER PRIEST NOR CATHOLIC! and we refer our readers to any priest in this city, for confirmation of both assertions.

Pascal was A JANSENIST, separated with that sect, from the Catholic Church, and one of their ablest champions in their war against the Jesuists. The following extracts, translated from the Abbe de Feller's "Dictionaire Historique," article "Blaise Pascal," will sufficiently illustrate the credibility of those who invoke his testimony to support the calumnies of Mr. Adams.

The original work, from which we borrow, may be consulted in the libraries at the Catholic Seminary in this city.

After mentioning the retreat of Pascal to the head quarters of the Jansenists, at "Port-Royal-des-Champs," the writer (Feller) proceeds—"The solitaries who inhabited this desert, were then in the ardour of their disputes with the Jesuits. They sought all ways to render these fathers odious; Pascal did more, in the eyes of the French; he turned them into ridicule. His eighteen "Provincial letters," appeared all in quarto, one after the other, from the month of January 1656, to the month of March in the following year. They are a medley of delicate pleasantry and violent satire. * * * The "Provincial letters" were struck with the lightnings of Ecclesiastical Authority, and of the civil power. The Pope, the Council of State, the Parliament, the Bishops, condemned them as *a defamatory libel.* The Parliament of Aix had them burned by the hang-

man, on the 9th of February, 1667. * * * 'Do you think' says Racine, that "the Provincial letters" are any thing else but comedies? The author has chosen his personages in the Convents, and in the Sorbonne. He introduces upon the scene, sometimes Jacobins, sometimes doctors, and always the Jesuits," &c. From the testimony of Racine, sustained by that of the infidel Voltaire himself, who acknowledges, in his "age of Louis XIV." that "the whole book rests on falsehood;" "that Pascal had endeavoured, in these letters, to prove that the Jesuits had formed a design to corrupt the human race, a design which no society has ever had, nor ever can have," the Abbe (Feller) passes, among other things, to remark upon the melancholy alienation of mind, which befel Pascal, in his latter days, in these mild but emphatic terms—"His adversaries have availed themselves too much of this derangment of his organization, to diminish the great estimation which his party were forced to ascribe to one of their most zealous adepts. Far from imitating a proceeding which seems to lack of generosity, we will content ourselves, according to the example of St. Jerome, with regretting that a man so talented and so pious, at least according to the strongest appearances, should not have been unequivocally attached to the great tree of the Church. *I say nothing more than that the man was* NOT OF THE CHURCH." The authority of Feller needs no vindication with any well informed Catholic.

So much for the witness. But the doctrine he is cited to sustain, is rather *less Catholic* than Pascal. Have these gentlemen, who, to cover their political leader, represent their Church the slave of "enormities and encroachments," of "a spirit of usurpation which led to the destruction of millions of the human race &c." forgotten their daily profession of faith in "One HOLY Catholic and Apostolic Church?" Have they forgotten that her HOLINESS UNSUSCEPTIBLE OF STAIN is one of the marks by which the Universal Church is known? and that consequently the "gates of Hell" could "not prevail against her" in the seventeenth century, nor before nor since? Their headlong zeal for the *defamer* betrays them into error concerning the *Institution defamed.* They suppose an ideal Church, verifying in theory alone her master's promise of perpetuity, while her whole visible frame is corrupt; and content their Catholicity with asserting her uninterrupted "Orthodoxy in profession" while stigmatizing her with "APOSTACY IN PRACTICE." Let them not think to cover their rashness, by the attempt to confuse, what, to save Mr. Adams, they are forced to say *of their Church*, into a censure only of "some of its members." Their own language has failed under the desperate service. They speak of "a *meeker* and *more Christian* principle which regulates the *dicipline* and *practice* of *the Church in our day*," what is this but saying, that a *less Christian spirit did regulate her dicipline and practice formerly?* The charge, in effect, is as direct against

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH as we shall presently prove that of Mr. Adams to have been; and we leave it for our opponents to settle it with their consciences, before their next Easter Communion—

And here perhaps it may not be amiss to notice a calumnious interrogatory by "well wisher." He asks, (page 5) "was not Galileo compelled to recant his doctrine that the earth and not the sun moved round?" We tell him no, *nor Copernicus the Priest* before him! on the contrary, both were caressed and rewarded for their intellectual achievements by the highest dignitaries of the Catholic Church. Galileo's first visit to Rome in 1611 was marked by the admiration and honours awarded to his genius by the Pontifical Court—At his second visit in 1615 he experienced no dimunition of similar demonstrations of respect and esteem. But the zeal of authorship betrayed him into indiscretion. He insisted that the Pope should declare the system of Copernicus founded on the Bible. Paul V. wearied by frequent memorials to this effect, referred the matter to a congregation; who simply decided *that the Bible did not teach the doctrine of the earths motion* leaving the astronomical dogma uncontroverted, and barely prohibiting Galileo from appealing to sacred writ, which was designed for other ends, for confirmation of his philosophical speculations. Galileo acquiesced in the decree, regarded it as no ways injurious to himself, or his system, and departed on the most gracious terms with the Pope. For fifteen years he continued to promulgate his philosophical doctrines, and respect the prohibition touching appeals to the scripture; whose authority the Cardinals had felt it their duty to protect against the evil consequences of its being pressed into the service of scientific disputants, and identified with theories of external nature which might be subsequently disproved. In 1632, however, he reproduced the memoirs of 1616—was attacked and dedicated his reply to Pope Urban VIII. In 1633 he returned again to Rome; was received with extraordinary respect and attention; not a word was said about prisons or dungeons; he was permitted to remain all the time at the palace of the Tuscan Ambassador, except during eighteen days that he was lodged in the apartments of the fiscal of the Holy Office, with permission to ride out daily. He was afterwards sent back to the Tuscan Ambassador's palace. No question was made in the cause of the grounds of his system—the point was its pretended conformity with the Bible. The sentence conformed to the previous one. Galileo conceded the point in controversy, and was at liberty. These notes are gathered from a treatise published in this city some years since and ascribed to the Rev. Mr. Brute, who quotes Guichardin the Marquis de Nicholini, and the letters of Galileo himself. We should hardly have approached so near to what savours of Religious controversy, had not the indiscretion of our Catholic opponents already engaged us in the vindication of their own Church.

From the abstract principles of the defence, we turn to some of its specific details;—and here we cannot repress the expression of our *surprise* at the charge of "garbling" and "mutilating" Mr. Adams' language which has been urged against us. This, if it mean any thing, implies that we have *misrepresented his sentiments*; and we frankly own it was *the last we expected* to meet. It is answered best by a republication of the language itself. We begin with the fourth of July oration, including within brackets such parts as we originally deemed, and still think, superfluous to our subject.

The reader will observe the speakers' object to have been, to trace the rise and progress of civil and religious liberty, throughout the world. With the *former* branch of his subject, we had nothing to do; and we trust we know enough of the *latter*, to have left him unmolested to its discussion, had his notions been advanced with common decency. But we meant to shew, *without regard to whatever political face he chose to wear that day*, that he *did speak* of *the religion we are proud to profess*, *with unprovoked malignity and gratuitous contempt*. We confined our extracts, *exclusively*, to those which related to it; and to have mingled with them what appertained to a totally different subject would have argued as little *singleness of understanding*, on our part, as it does of *singleness* of *motive*, on that of our respondents.

["Governed themselves by a race of kings, whose title to sovereignty had originally been founded in conquest *spell-bound for a succession of ages under*] THAT PORTENTOUS SYSTEM OF DESPOTISM AND OF SUPERSTITION WHICH IN THE NAME OF THE MEEK AND HUMBLE JESUS HAD BEEN SPREAD OVER THE CHRISTIAN WORLD, [the history of this nation had, for a period of seven hundred years, from the days of the conquest till our own, exhibited a conflict almost continual, between the oppressions of power and the claims of right.] *In the theories of the Crown and the* MITRE *man had no rights. Neither the body nor the* SOUL *of the individual was his own.* From the impenetrable gloom of this INTELLECTUAL DARKNESS, and the deep degradation of this servitude, the British nation had partially emerged. [The martyrs of religious freedom had consumed to ashes at the stake: the champions of temporal liberty had bowed their heads upon the scaffold; and the spirits of many a bloody day had left their earthly vesture upon the field of battle, and soared to plead the cause of Liberty before the throne of heaven. The people of Britain, through long ages of civil war, had extorted from their tyrants not *acknowledgments*, but *grants*, of right. With this concession they had been content to stop in the progress of human improvement. They received their freedom as a donation from their sovereigns; they appealed for their privileges to a sign manual and a seal; they held their title to liberty, like their title to lands, from the bounty

of a man; and in their moral and political chronology, the great charter of Runny Mead was the beginning of the world.

"From the earliest ages of their recorded history, the inhabitants of the British Islands have been distinguished for their intelligence and their spirit.] How much of these two qualities, the fountains of all amelioration in the condition of men, was stifled by these two principles of *subserviency to ecclesiastical usurpation*, [and of holding rights as the donation of kings,] this is not the occasion to inquire.

"Of their tendency to palsy the vigor and enervate the faculties of man, all philosophical reasoning, and all actual experience, concur in testimony.

["These principles, however, were not peculiar to the people of Britain.] *They were the delusions of all Europe, still the most enlightenened and most improvable portion of the earth.* [The temporal chain was riveted upon the people of Britain by the conquest.] THEIR SPIRITUAL FETTERS *were forged by* SUBTLETY *working upon* SUPERSTITION. [Baneful as the effect of these principles was, they could not for ever extinguish the light of reason in the human mind. The discovery of the Mariner's Compass was soon followed by the extension of intercourse between nations the most distant, and which, without that *light beaming in darkness* to guide the path of man over the boundless waste of waters, could never have been known to each other. The invention of Printing, and the composition of gunpowder, which revolutionized at once the art and science of war, and the relations of peace; the revelation of India to Vasco de Gama; and the disclosure to Columbus of the American hemisphere, all resulted from the incompressible energies of the human intellect,] bound and crippled as it was by the double cords of *ecclesiastical imposture* [and political oppression. To these powerful agents in the progressive improvement of our species, Britain can lay no claim.—For them the children of men are indebted to Italy, to Germany, to Portugal, and to Spain. All these improvements, however, consisted in successful researches into the properties and modifications of external nature. THE RELIGIOUS REFORMATION *was an improvement in the science of mind; an improvement in the intercourse of man with his Creator, and in his acquaintance with himself.* It was an *advance in the knowledge of his duties* and his *rights*. It was a step in the progress of man in comparison with which the Magnet and Gunpowder, the wonders of either India; nay, the Printing Press itself, were but the paces of a pigmy to the stride of a giant. If to this step of human advancement Germany likewise lays claim in the person of Martin Luther, or in the earlier but ineffectual martyrdom of John Huss, England may point to her Wicliffe as a yet more primitive vindicator of the same righteous cause, and may insist on the glory of having contributed her share to the improvement of the moral condition of man.]

"THE CORRUPTIONS *and* USURPATIONS *of the* CHURCH *were the immediate objects of these* REFORMERS; but, at the foundation of all their exertions, there was a single, plain, and almost self evident principle—that man has a right to the exercise of his own reason. It was this principle which the SOPHISTRY and RAPACITY *of the* CHURCH *had obscured and obliterated, and which the intestine divisions of the same Church itself first restored.* The triumph of reason was the result of inquiry and discussion. [Centuries of desolating wars have succeeded, and oceans of human blood have flowed for the final establishment of this principle; but it was from the darkness of the Cloister that the first spark was emitted, and from the arches of an University that it first kindled into day. From the discussion of religious rights and duties, the transition to that of the political and civil relations of men with one another, was natural and unavoidable; in both, the reformers were met by the weapons of temporal power.] *At the same glance of reason,* THE TIARA *would have fallen from the brow of priesthood,* [and the despotic sceptre would have departed from the hand of royalty,] but for the SWORD by which they were protected—that sword which, like the flaming sword of the Cherubim, turned every way to debar access to the tree of life."

Let any man, who understands English, now venture to deny, that by "*that portentous system of* DESPOTISM *and* SUPERSTITION which in the name of the *meek and humble* JESUS *had been spread over the Christian world,*" was meant the CATHOLIC RELIGION.

Our opponents themselves, or those who compiled the answer by fifteen, must have understood it so; else why (when *professing* to give "the extracts which were made the ground work" of our accusation) omit the entire paragraph about the "Religious Reformation," Luther, Huss, and Wickliffe? That paragraph, (*omitted by them, omitted too* by "Well wisher" *while he scrupled not to say* "here is the whole,") nailed the insulting libel upon the door of our Sanctuary! For what was "the Religious Reformation" but a direct disavowal of, and protest against the doctrines and authority of the Catholic Church? Against what "corruptions and usurpations" did Luther and the other reformers testify, but those which they ascribed to the Catholic Church? We have, for popular effect, been charged with subservience to the craft of "some young lawyer." Our adversaries are exempt, at least, from this; for it requires not a second reading to show that their attempt to distort the words in question into an innocent censure of "the unholy alliances between Kings and Clergy, in what are called Established Churches," was the production of *no lawyer.* This will appear more clearly from the very next paragraph of the oration to that which we have quoted already.

"The double contest against the *oppressors of the Church* and State was too appalling for the vigor, or too comprehensive for the faculties of the *reformers* of the European Continent. In

Britain alone was it undertaken, and in Britain but partially succeeded.

"It was in the midst of that fermentation of the human intellect which brought right and power in direct and deadly conflict with each other, that the rival crowns of the two portions of the British Island, were united on the same head. It was then that, *released from the manacles of ecclesiastical domination*, the minds of men began to investigate the foundations of civil government."

It is essential to a complete understanding of the foregoing remarks, to advert to the historical fact, that though the *Protestant Reformation*, which commenced with Luther, spread rapidly over a large portion of the Continent, the political constitutions of Europe, underwent few radical changes till the explosion of the French Revolution. While in England, on the other hand, the stern race of Tudor, under whom the *religious changes* were consummated, had scarcely ceased to reign, when the *political* disputes began which terminated in the revolution of 1688, and the establishment of the government on a more popular basis. When Mr. Adams, therefore, speaks of a "double contest against the oppressors of the Church and State," "undertaken in Britain alone," he must be understood to refer to the *two revolutions* in that country; one in *politics*, the other in *religion*. And it is for the unseasonable and indecorous terms in which he descants upon the *latter*, that we hold him responsible. His admirers, indeed, are but ill aware of the stigma they attach to his boasted literary reputation, when they strain their criticism to prove him railing, in these offensive paragraphs, only against "Established Churches." For, *had that been his design*, how strangely *ignorant* or *forgetful* must he have been, of the existence of "an Established Church," in England, from the days of Edward VI. to the present hour! Since the existence of that Church would have been *utterly inconsistent* with his assertion that, at the time when "the rival crowns" of England and Scotland were united on the head of James I. "the minds of men" were "released from the *manacles* of *ecclesiastical domination*." Our adversaries may choose from the dilemma. If Mr. Adams intended by "the manacles of ecclesiastical domination" nothing more nor less than Established Churches, he proved himself ignorant of the notorious fact that "an Established Church" exists in England, and did exist at the time of which he wrote. If he meant not Established Churches, he pointed at the subverted authority of the Catholic Church.

From the wanton contumely of this unlucky oration, we passed in our address, to the indecent libels and senseless ridicule of the "Silesian letters." And we did it, *as we intimated*, for the *very reasons urged by his advocates*, in his defence—because "they were the unstudied effusions of his mind"---because "they were addressed, in the unreservedness of fraternal affection and confidence, to a

brother." We thought, and we still think, that these private expressions afford *a surer indication of the secret workings of the soul*, than a thousand *set speeches, official appointments, or public displays of munificence.* We quoted them, *as we now refer to them*, to prove how deeply the very fountains of his existence are tinged with the bitterness of sectarian hatred; to set forth his sentiments *in youth*, as a commentary on his language *in age.* But, when we spoke of *youth*, we meant not *the boyhood* of the *head* or the *heart.* We spoke of the *full age of vigour* in both; ere the lapse of thirty after years had chilled the one to more rigid prejudice, and disciplined the other to habitual craft. We spoke of *a man who had been appointed to two foreign missions*, and was in actual attendance *on a third*---of a *married* man, the presence of whose wife, if nothing else, ought to have chastened his feelings to something less filthily indecent than his foul aspersions of the nuns of Schweidnitz and Sprotau. But, say our antagonists, these letters were written "without the remotest intention or suspicion of their being laid before the public." How stands the fact? They were written, as appears from the dates annexed, at intervals from the 20th of July, 1800, to the 17th of March, 1801; and were first published, weekly, from the 3d of January, 1801, in the Port Folio. It is true the tour through Silesia was achieved in rather more than two months; but many of the most slanderous paragraphs were subsequently written from Berlin. Now it seems hardly consistent with the courtesy and confidence which usually regulate family correspondence, that without the knowledge of the writer, and his assent first obtained, these letters should have been published, nearly *six* months after the date of the first, and continued, in weekly succession, for ten months therefrom: and it is still less improbable, that, had the publication been disagreeable to him, they would have been *republished with his name annexed.*

We readily believe that the author did not, at the time, foresee the illustration, in his own instance, of the Scriptural imprecation: "Oh that mine enemy had written a book!" We ascribe his whole calamity to that silly fondness for seeing himself in print which has borne him through the---

"Many a foolscap page, he in his time hath written."

The question is, however, what did he write and publish? Have our opponents ventured to deny, that he did most grossly libel two societies of defenceless women whom he never saw, and who had devoted themselves to the service of God in the calm seclusion of their cloisters? Have they denied that he did insinuate those holy retreats to be the secret haunts of beastly debauchery? We will not stain our page again, but refer you *to his own words*, and repeat our challenge to him, or any who uphold him, to publish a like statement concerning any similar association of Catholic ladies in the District of Columbia, or this State.

It is not always, however, that the thoughts of Mr. Adams stand forth like his libels of the Nuns, in such bold relief; undivested of the cumbrous veil of words, the tearing off of which, exposes us to the charge of "mangling" and "garbling," when our only object is to spare the printer's and the reader's trouble. Our adversaries, therefore, will possibly grumble, that *we gave not all he said*, concerning St. Hedwige; though we quoted enough to the point we had in view, the exposure of *his statement* of "the grounds of canonization" in the Catholic Church. We will add, therefore, from his bright side of her picture, that you may judge of his inducements to ridicule and misrepresent one, whom a numerous portion of his fellow-citizens believe to have enjoyed the peculiar favour of our Creator; one of whom you may read, in her life by Alban Butler, (October 17,) that "she acquitted herself of all her respective duties, towards God, her husband, her children and her family—that though she gave her whole dower towards the foundation of the great Monastery of Cistercian Nuns, at Trebnitz, she appointed but one-tenth of the revenue to the support of professed Nuns, and allotted the remainder to nine hundred young ladies of reduced families, who were to be educated in piety, and afterwards provided with competent portions *to marry advantageously* in the world—that she exhausted her revenues in relieving the necessitous, and that though "with going to churches barefoot, sometimes over ice and snow, her feet were often blistered, and left the ground stained with traces of her blood," this penitential act, which so roused the "American Minister's" sarcastic spleen, was not ostentatiously displayed, but that "she carried shoes under her arms, to put on if she met any one." Mr. Adams says, (letter 13th) that "according to the tattling old servant," "she was that famous example of conjugal affection of whom all the world has heard; who, upon the Castle's being taken, after a long siege, obtained leave of the enemy's general to carry off her most precious effects; and, under that denomination, took upon her back, to the astonishment of both armies and all posterity, her husband." Surely, were there ever a recommendation of the dead to the indulgent regard of a *husband* and a *gentleman*, it might be found in this simple tradition!

It was our intention, when we commenced this rejoinder, to have published anew every extract from the writings of Mr. Adams, from which we had rejected the superfluous matter, giving credit for the omission by asterics; but our limits have unavoidably been so far extended already, that we have changed our plan to a republication of those passages only, which we have been specifically charged with "garbling." In the mean time we request our readers to compare the quotations in our "address," one by one, with the original letters, &c. and we defy our respondents to prove a single fraud upon us. Be it noted, by the way, that they shrunk from the charge that Mr. Adams did assign, in his thirtieth letter, "SUPERSTITION," *excessive veneration* for the *Monks*," and "*liberality to the Church*."

as "*the grounds*" upon which St. Hedwige was raised to the SENATE *of the* ROMAN CATHOLIC MYTHOLOGY." And we charge them also, with giving a cautious *go by* to his no less insulting and slanderous insinuation, in his 20th letter, that Catholics believe their sins forgiven on their kissing a relic.

An imputation of dishonesty has been predicated upon our extracts from the 23d letter; and we notice it, because it perchance has met the eye of respectable men. We give them entire, therefore, that you may judge of our "credibility." "*In order to increase the solemnity* and *duration* of the *processions*, within the Church itself, and all around the village of Almendorf, are little Chapels containing representations of the life and sufferings of Christ; at each of which the processions stop to kneel, and pray, and kiss the holy relics still exposed at each of these stations. The most remarkable of these relics, is a wisp of the straw upon which the infant Jesus lay in the stable, immediately after his birth. It is under a large iron plate with a small square hole in the centre, through which a half an inch length of the straw may be seen. The iron plate is almost worn and rusted away with the kisses *of the pious blind people*, who believe in its authenticity. I was attended by one of the clerical persons who officiate in the Church, but *he was so ashamed of his relics, that I perceived it gave him pain when I read the inscriptions round them, purporting what they are*, and ceased indulging my curiosity in this respect. He repeated, several times, that the authenticity of the relics was extremely questionable; and in particular, declared his own conviction, that a wisp of straw *could not be kept in preservation*, from the time of Christ's birth, until the present."

It is said, that we were bound to retail the account given by this "devout man," Mr. Adams, of his "carefully avoiding to wound the feelings of those who differ from him in creed." This we deny. The question of his delicate forbearance towards Catholics we had settled elsewhere—Our charge never extended to his immediate personal intercourse with them. We can hardly believe, that even in the hey-day of his epistolary sportiveness, he would have insulted a Nun with his loathsome jests, had he encountered one at the grate, or, in the case of one not cloistered, (like our "Sisters of Charity") at the bedside of a dying man. Our object was to expose as the libeller of our Church, the man whom we were invited, *as Catholics*, to sustain in office. The passage in question is an unequivocal attempt to ridicule the Catholics, and expose them to scorn for their respect towards objects which, have been honored by their connection with the "living temples of God;" and, to enforce the irony, a "clerical person" is introduced, acknowledging an imposture practised upon the ignorant by the governors of his particular Church. We will, for argument, admit that there was here no "traveller's story;" that a Catholic clergy-

man did volunteer the singular proposition, that a wisp of straw, which had been consecrated as the couch of his incarnate God, *could not* endure 1800 years. We will suppose there was no lurking sneer in the precision of voice, or demure conduct of the eye of the "devout" visitor, which inflicted "the pain" we read of.—Was there no insult levelled at the Catholic community—no intention to disparage them or their religion, in the estimation of their Protestant brethren, in the *published narrative* we quoted from? Compare it with our extracts from letters 20th and 25th, and if the result be not an accordance with our understanding of it, the cause must exist in some impediment of the intellect or the will. If our interpretation of it be admitted as correct, *we filled the measure of our obligation, by setting forth the whole of the libellous matter.*

In the prosecution of our review, we observe no vindication or disavowal by our opponents of the *Adams legend*, concerning Ariscislaus, the ducal convert alledged by him to have led the way in Christianising Silesia. They have been equally prudent in relation to his charge, in the 41st letter, that "from the period of the foundation" (of the Silesian bishopric, A.D. 966,) "for more than four centuries, the opinion was almost universally prevalent here, as in the rest of Europe, *that the compendium of all human virtue, and the atonement of all human vice*, consisted in founding, building, and endowing Churches, Cloisters, and other religious houses."

But, when we accused him of inculcating the *essential intolerance of Catholics*, in his 35th letter, we perceive that we fell into our trade of "clipping and mangling," judge ye how dishonestly!

"One century had elapsed since the commencement of Luther's reformation, and in the course of that time the princes and people of Germany, had become divided into two parties, of nearly equal strength; one adhering to popery, and the other adopting the Protestant doctrines. The house of Austria, (in whom the imperial dignity had in a manner become hereditary) *continued zealously Catholic, and by uniting the principles of intolerance*, with the practice of oppression, compelled the Protestants, not only of its own dominions, but throughout Europe, to combine in leagues for the mutual support of each other." Now, if these sentences do not imply that Catholic principles are those of "intolerance," Mr. Adams ought to have been sent to grammar school, instead of setting up, at Cambridge, as a teacher of style some few years after. But he wrote, on this occasion, too clearly for himself and his friends, as appears from our quotation from letter 41st, where he spoke of "*the Catholic doctrine of bringing back all stragglers from the Church by compulsion.*"

To deprive our adversaries of the very shadow of a defence, we now insert an extract from letter 3d, lest they seize upon it to give some colour to their charge of "mutilation."—It is proper to re-

mark, however, that it was no part of our intention to wound the feelings of those who differ from us, which explains the original omission; and we joyfully improve the occasion to remark, that while a prudent regard to our own reputation induces us to set forth *the text of Mr. Adams*, he has in his own person, afforded the *only illustration of it*, we have had the misfortune to encounter, in our own country. "*The Catholics hate the Protestants the more for their having now the secure and unlimited liberty in their worship;* and the Protestants envy the Catholics the privileges they still retain, which the Prussian government has bound itself to preserve."

But these extracts and those which follow in our address, touching the unfair apportionment of the Churches of Breslau, the "trumpery of the Catholic religious orders, and "*the dominion of the Catholic clergy over the souls, bodies and estates of men*," are passed over by our opponents with *heedful disregard.* We agree with them that it were indeed "absurd" to attempt "a detailed vindication." They know that they manifest too clearly the feelings and sentiments of Mr. Adams. They know too that we gave their complete sense, and the general, but unsupported charge of their being "broken and dislocated," will not avail as an excuse for their *evasion.* When men of character stake their reputations against others, a reflecting community looks for *facts* and not *assertions.* "*Broken*" when applied in this manner, implies with writers of intelligence, *a destruction* of *the author's idea*—"*dislocated*" signifies *that forcible separation of a passage from the context which presents a meaning different from what he intended.*— When either course can be proven upon us, we shall candidly confess we have been mistaken in the writings of Mr. Adams; but it must first be revealed to us, by some higher authority than that of our opponents; that Mr. Adams was *altogether ignorant* of the language in which he wrote, that he knew not the most familiar rules of the art which he subsequently essayed to teach, and that his heart meanwhile was overflowing with the milk of Christain tolerance for Catholics, instead of controversial gall.

After the citation of the *Jansenist Pascal*, as "a Catholic and a Priest," we have a right, in all courtesy, to demand some better evidence than mere assertion, for the account by our opponents of the manner in which a report by Mr. Adams "the gentleman now at the head of the American government," came to be "on record" in a British house of Parliament, and operate against the claims of our oppressed Irish brethren. British statesmen and officers of the crown, though not always more liberal on certain points than our President, are generally good scholars, and somewhat better acquainted with their mother tongue, than his vindicators would have us consider the author of our "broken and mutilated" extracts. But if what they say on this point be true, it proves no less, *that the book which "well wisher" untruly said, we did "not build much on," was*

at least considered a foundation for continued oppressions of the Irish, by the British ministry.

We are only surprised that our adversaries went no further—that they did not reprobate the Catholics for rejecting the offers of "the Solicitor General" and cite with him, the "Silesian letters" to balance the protest of the Irish Bishops and their clergy.

Before we dismiss them, however, we venture two questions.—When Mr. Adams said in letter 3d, Speaking of reserved cases, "I expected to have found some heinous crimes upon the list, but, *unless the murder of a priest may be considered as of that denomination*, there was not one;" do his advocates understand him to express a serious doubt of the heinous guilt of murdering any man? or do they think that the circumstance of the murdered person's being *a priest* constituted Mr. Adams's ground for speaking dubiously of the criminality of the murderer? or do they believe, *with us*, that he meant no more than a sportive expression of *contempt for the Catholic priesthood*, "addressed in the unreservedness of fraternal confidence to a brother?" Again, when he charged (in letter 42d) the Catholic clergy of Silesia with too much indolence for the increased labour of instruction, and *with dread for the stability of their Church "from the dispersion of intellectual light,"* when he emphatically added, "*they considered alike the spirit of innovation and the spirit of enquiry as their natural enemies.*"—What do our opponents understand him to mean?

From the clumsy tissue of anti-Catholic scurrility and misrepresentation, interwoven with the heavy fabric of the "Silesian" correspondence, which was spread before the American people, like a family banner, to remind them of the absent heir, we turn again to those drowsy lullabies for the Cambridge youth, *of other times* "the Lectures on Rhetoric." And here it again becomes our painful duty to animadvert upon the course of those who have undertaken to answer us. If their rule be right that the *whole* of a passage cited should be given to the reader, *whether it relates to the subject before him or no;* how much more should *all* be quoted *which is essentially connected with it!* Why then did they, in citing from the Lectures, omit the following paragraph which is separated, by only four lines, from what they are pleased to represent as "a compliment to the usefulness of the Catholic Church?" "At one time the pulpit has been made the vehicle of unintelligible mysticism; at another of unfathomable metaphysics; at a third of fanatical inflammation. It has been *the instrument of the worst abuses of the Romish Church*, and the most effectual weapon of the Reformation. Athanasius, Peter the Hermit, Wicliffe, Huss, Luther and Calvin, successively and sucessfully employed this mighty engine for the propagation of *error* and of Truth." (vol. I. page 323.) Truly our respondents give us credit for patience! Are there not here two subjects in immediate opposition, "the *abuses of the Romish Church*" and the *reformation*?"—and when

the author speaks, in the next sentence of *error* and *truth*, can we believe him to apply them *indiscriminately* to the "*Abuses*" and the "*Reform?*" Will then any candid man deny that "*propagation of error*" was ascribed to those who upheld what are called "the abuses?" It cannot be!

We are next compelled to republish six entire pages in order to place the rash accusation of "misrepresentation" in its proper light. We adhere to the rule we adopted with the Fourth of July Address in relation to the phrases originally omitted and supplied, in "the Address," by asterisks;—and we ask an attentive comparison of that pamphlet with this.

["It has long been remarked, that there is a striking difference between the eloquence of the pulpit, as it has appeared in the compositions of the French and of the English divines.] *A French sermon is a popular discourse, addressed almost exclusively to the feelings of the auditory;* [clothed in a most gorgeous attire of rhetoric, and calculated only to make an impression upon the heart.] *An English sermon is, or rather was until of late years, a cold, unimpassioned application to the understanding;* [abounding with solid reason and logical argument, but seldom attempting to warm or interest the passions of the hearers. The practice appears in both instances to have preceded the theory; but the French system first found an able advocate in the celebrated Fenelon, archbishop of Cambray; and the modern English writers upon rhetoric, without duly considering] *the principal cause of the difference,* [have adopted his ideas, and yielded perhaps too readily the palm of victory to the French doctrine.

"The cause to which I allude, and which I apprehend contributed much more to influence the character and composition of English sermons, and to mark their difference from those of the French, than the mere diversity of national character, to which it has generally been ascribed,] *is no other than the Protestant reformation. In France and in other Roman Catholic countries,* [where every point of doctrine was an article of faith,] *the exclusion of reasoning from the desk is just and consistent. The christian is not allowed to be a reasoner; he is only a believer.* [His religious opinions are given him, not for examination and scrutiny, but for implicit and unhesitating assent.] *The sacred scriptures themselves are held to be mysteries above his understanding,* [and his creed is never submitted to the decision of his judgment. The French doctrine of pulpit oratory is a natural consequence from the doctrine of an infallible church, and inseparably connected with it.] *Under such a church, there can be no occasion for argumentative sermons; and reasoning is very naturally expelled from the pulpits.* [But the Protestant churches profess to make the reason of every individual the umpire of his faith. They admit no infallible rule of faith, other than the scriptures. The assiduous perusal of these they not only permit, but enjoin upon all their

followers; and abandon their construction and exposition to his own judgment. The explanation and elucidation of the scriptures thus become one of the most arduous and important duties of the Protestant preacher; a duty, which he can discharge only by enlightening the understandings of his people.

"In order to test the correctness of this French system of sermonizing, and to show that it is adapted only to the practice of an infallible church, let us attend only to those classes of subjects for the disquisitions of the pulpit, which are among the most suitable for a Protestant divine, but which become useless and improper, where they are prescribed, as undeniable articles of faith.

"If the end of the preacher's discourse is the happiness of his hearers both in this and the future life, by means of their improvement in knowledge and virtue, that portion of the duty, which consists in the communication of knowledge, must of necessity be addressed to the hearers' reason. The faith of the Protestant layman must often depend upon the degree of information, which he may receive from his religious instructor. The existence and attributes of the Deity, the nature and immortality of the soul, the doctrine of future rewards and punishments, the evidences of revealed religion, the peculiar character of its precepts, a comparison of its system of morals with those of the Chinese, Indian, Persian, Egyptian, Greek, and Arabian legislators and philosophers, an internal comparison between the Mosaic and Christian dispensations, or in other words between the principles of the law and those of the gospel, these are all themes, upon which the Protestant teacher may and ought freely to expatiate for the improvement of his hearers in knowledge. But they admit of no discussion, where the preacher himself and all his flock are compelled to believe whatever has been prescribed to them on these all important questions, and have no further to look for their creed, than to the decisions of the church.] *A Roman Catholic believes in the existence of a God, in the immortality of his own soul, and in a future state of retribution, because the holy church has told him they are articles of faith. But he is not allowed to ask the reason why. A Protestant is told to believe these fundamental points of religion, because upon examination he will find them as satisfactorily proved to his reason*, [as he will discover them to be important to his happiness. Now the evidences of these primary principles are not obvious to every mind. They are liable to numerous and plausible objections. Not only the thoughtless and the profligate, but shallow reasoners and philosophical dogmatists dispute and deny them. The wolves of infidelity are prowling around every fold. Surely under such a state of things it is the duty of the pastor to guard his flock by every kind of security. It is as much his duty to detect the sophistical semblance of reason, as to repel the impetuous onset of the passions.

"These three articles form the basis of what is called natural religion; and the belief in them does not always imply that of christianity. This is barely a question of evidence, which in this, as in all other objects of controversy, is partly external and partly internal. When the truth of christian revelation is contested, it becomes the minister of the gospel not only to be able to give a reason for the faith that is in him, but furnish those of his hearers, less qualified to search into the depths of such inquires, with a reason equally satisfactory to themselves.

"When both these difficulties at the threshold of religious persuasion have been removed, when the atheist and the deist have both been silenced, and the firm belief in divine revelation is established, then] *the volume of sacred inspiration is opened before the preacher, and it is his duty to make it profitable to his hearers for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness. The field here opened to the Protestant divine is inexhaustible. To the Roman Catholic preacher it is never opened at all. For with what propriety could he reason to his audience from a book which they are not permitted to read?*

["In making these observations it is not my design either to pass a censure upon any prevailing system of christianity, or to question the correctness of the French theory of pulpit eloquence, as adapted to the church, where it originated; but to caution those of you, who may hereafter assume the pastoral office, against the implicit adoption of the critical creed of the French school, which the recent English theorists have too much countenanced. A Protestant divine, who looks upon his pulpit merely as a chair for the delivery of moral lectures, or a stage to work upon the passions of his auditory, as at a theatrical representation. has a very inadequate idea of his duties and of his powers. The earnest and ardent inculcation of moral duties is undoubtedly one of the essential obligations of the preacher; and in discharging it he is bound to lay hold of every hope and every fear, that can influence the heart of man. But to enlighten the mind is one of the most effectual means of amending the heart; and] *the societies of christians, who place themselves under the administration of a spiritual monitor, have a right to expect, that he should consider and treat them as rational, no less than as sensitive beings.*" (Vol. i. p. 332.)

We now ask of those interested in this controversy to resume our "address," and satisfy themselves, whether the extracts we gave in it are not to be found, distinctly and unequivocally expressed, in the unmutilated language of Mr. Adams. From our opponents we anticipate no contradiction. If it be their pleasure, here too, as in other instances, to *justify* what they cannot deny that Mr. Adams has said—we cannot help it—we shall only intreat of them, as we wish Mr. Adams to do, to "speak for themselves."

It was prudent generalship in our adversaries to array against us the sacred name of "Carrol"—but why not counteract "the ef-

fect" sought by us, by denying that Mr. Adams stigmatised the Jesuits as systematic liars?—or why not rather, (as they side with the Jansensist Pascal against the Jesuits, and yet dare not disavow respect for their late Archbishop) deny at once that John Carrol was a thorough bred Jesuit—"*an ante-diluvian*"—trained in those citadels of learning and piety which the tide of secular prejudice subsequently threw down?—we leave you to answer the questions.

Again, did Mr. Adams charge us with idolatry in his "sprightly" contrast between the Heathen Mythology and the Roman Catholic doctrines? The silence of his advocates would imply their assent. No! this is but one of the countless passages that have been "culled" from books which few persons care to read entire. "Is it necessary" then, as a Catholic doctor said of Justin Martyr, "to drink the whole sea before we can pronounce it salt?" and must we be drenched with all the vapid floods of Mr. Adams' pen, to know that, when he writes of us, it distils a bitter relish drawn from the very sluices of his heart? But we are asked, what all this virulence can operate against us, though infused into the minds of American youth? How can the lawgivers of America fetter us with legislative restraints, in contravention of the Constitution? We answer, is the constitution unchangeable? cannot the ordaining power model it anew? But, supposing it unchanged, are not Congress the arbiters of "naturalization," and might not, at some future day, a policy similar *to that which, under this administration, would exclude every foreigner from the naval service, mercantile or military*, as being *unworthy of confidence*, exclude also from our *political community*, as *unworthy of trust*, the myriads of Catholics who come to us from the fertile margins of the Rhine, from the icy cliffs of Switzerland,—the vineyards and olive grounds of Italy,—the sunny hills of France and Spain, and the green fields of Erin, "lured by the splendor of the western star?"

What! say our opponents "the fountains of Justice poisoned too?" Aye, for we have read of courts, in the "partially emancipated" British nation, where "the defendant's witnesses being papists, were supposed to have received absolution to swear to any thing," and the prisoner was accordingly convicted.* And woe betide the Catholic witness judged by the standard of Mr. Adams!—

But, say the respondents, are the Catholics to be "written down too?" Why no—unless the scholars write better than their master and with the like good will.

At least Mr. Adams would not withhold from Catholics "the endearing charities." Perhaps not; occupying a prominent position, in a community abounding with respectable and influential Catholics, he *does not*, we believe, enquire the religion of beggars at his door; and he does buy things he dont want, at fashionable Catholic fairs!!

*See in a volume of cases filed with our vouchers, the trial of Eleanor Marchand, at the old Bailey in 1700—(page 45.)

To conclude—we asserted, in reference to the Panama mission, that "he could not conduct a diplomatic correspondence" touching a national right most precious to our protestant fellow citizens, without indulging a most offensive and imprudent "intemperance of expression"—and we say so still.

The very passage cited by our opponents, the only one they dared adduce, sustains our accusation; unless, by the etiquette of modern diplomacy, to charge a sovereign state with being influenced by "prejudices" be the road to favour. But let us look at the letter to Mr. Anderson and the message to the Senate.

We referred in the address to the former only of these. The expressions in the latter were severely chastised in the legislative body to which it was transmitted; which furnished the hint for *the softened tone* of the subsequent message to the House of Representatives, to which our opponents refer as showing "the full extent of that 'intemperance' which has drawn upon Mr. Adams this violent rebuke." It will be remembered that we drew a broad line between the *object* desired by Mr. Adams, and the *manner* in which he sought to attain it. As regards the *former* we entirely concur with him; but the *latter*, which resulted, we think, from the general temper of his religious opinions, was indiscreet and unstatesmanlike. We will illustrate this position. Suppose one of our friends who support Mr. Adams (and we have many such) had been disposed, in the spirit of that christian charity so earnestly recommended to us by the fifteen signers, to convince one of us that the statements in our address were unfounded in fact, and injurious to the President. Would he have commenced in this strain? "You are the slave of prejudice." "You are a political bigot." "You are influenced by an intolerant spirit." "Your party seldom listen to reason or justice." We conceive not, were he disposed only to maintain a courteous intercourse, much less if he wished to conciliate favour. Yet this was precisely the course of Mr. Adams towards the southern republics. Even if all he said were true, *that* did not render its *expression decorous* or *prudent*. Hear himself in his message to the Senate, of Dec. 26th, 1825.

"Some of the southern nations are, *even yet*, so far *under the dominion of prejudice*, that they have incorporated with their political constitutions an exclusive church; without the toleration of any other than the dominant sect. The abandonment of *this last badge of religious bigotry and oppression* may be pressed more effectually, by the united exertions of those who concur in the principles of freedom of conscience, upon those *who are yet to be convinced of their justice and wisdom*, than by the solitary efforts of a minister, &c."

So in his letter to Mr. Anderson, May 27th, 1823.

"Among the usual objects of negociation, in treaties of commerce and navigation, are the liberty of conscience and religious worship. *Articles to this effect have been seldom admitted in Ro-*

man Catholic countries and are even interdicted by the present constitution of Spain: *The South American Republics have been too much under the influence of the same intolerant spirit, &c.*"

The interests of diplomacy would, we think, have suffered little, had these haughty sentences been exchanged for a simple demand of reciprocal privileges in regard to *social worship*, for the Catholic and Protestant subjects of each contracting party.

We come now to the most curious portion of the replies. Its authors must consider it a powerful argument, for they have brought it forward not less than three times. Mr. Adams gives offices to Catholics! therefore, he never wrote against them, or writing against them he did not express his sentiments. This may be good logic with the present administration and its supporters; for it conclusively proves that the President and Secretary of State, never wrote against, or wrote their sentiments of each other, till their friendly reciprocation of good offices in 1825. To us, however, it appears the very aggravation of injury and insult. What! are Catholics to be spurned like hungry dogs and then appeased with a bone?

We have read of a wealthy Roman who amused himself by buffeting the passengers in the street, and instantly tendering the fine which unfortunately was limited by law. We trust *that principle* will never be tolerated by the Catholics of America, though some of their brethren bid them "be quiet—we should suffer worse in England *and not get the offices either!*" This unworthy argument, however, must, like the greater portion of the replies, be ascribed to an involuntary or intentional oversight of the true points in issue. The controversy is not whether Mr. Adams will give offices to Catholics, but whether Catholics will give office to him; and this we contend they will not do, "through favour to Catholics, however estimable," even though he has made a few appointments from among old established officers of the State Department, and the families of his political supporters;—though he did give letters of introduction to six young Catholic gentlemen, students of divinity!!! though he goes to Catholic fairs, where fashion compels him to go, and buys trinkets there in aid of *one of the most popular charities* IN THE COUNTRY. Neither will Catholics be intimidated by the threats of "well wisher," nor the appeals to Protestant prejudice wrung from the agony of his Catholic apologists. We have not attacked our Protestant brethren, and should disdain to invoke sectarian feeling in behalf of ourselves or our friends.

WILLIAM JENKINS,
EDWARD I. WILLSON,
WILLIAM GEORGE READ,
PHILIP LAURENSON,
T. PARKIN SCOTT,
JOHN CREAGH.

P. S. A copy of the Fourth of July Address—of the "Silesian Letters"—of the "Lectures on Rhetoric," and the "Panama" Correspondence, &c. may be consulted at the JACKSON READING ROOM, Water street.

DEC 5

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
0 011 895 473 7